

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

"The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth."

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, OCTOBER, 1852.

NO. 6.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

For the American Journal of Homœopathy.

SHORT COMINGS OF THE OLD SYSTEM —THE NEW SYSTEM BETTER.

I believe it is said that men with limited attainments like to dwell on small things. I do not care to dispute this maxim, even though my remarks should appear to afford an instance of its truth, for I lay no claim to greatness in my vocation. I will say, however, that sometimes much depends upon a small matter, as may be seen when we view the great developments around us in the works both of nature and of art, which have had small beginnings; and, therefore, that it is not always the part of wisdom to despise small things, simply for the reason that they are small.

In your Journal for July last you were pleased to insert a very short and hastily written article, the object of which was to show, and that by the help of a tolerably clear *argumentum ad hominem*, that, notwithstanding their lofty pretensions to the exclusive possession of all the learning, the gentlemen of the Old School have *something* yet to learn. Doctor Forbes, Physician to the Queen of England, has made it pretty plain that this something is no trifle, and his sentiments have since been pretty extensively endorsed by his brethren.

The quotation in that article, from the published writing of an old school doctor of our city, though in itself a small thing to dwell on, is really pregnant with much that is decisive in the controversy between the two schools. Allow me to reproduce it in full:—

"I find that small doses of Ipecacuanha will stop the vomiting, and that small doses of Rhubarb will stop the diarrhœa—a strange anomaly, surely."

Here is the announcement of a new dis-

covery in the allopathic camp; but it is extremely limited, it being confined to two drugs only. It is to be regretted that the learned gentleman did not extend his researches to other drugs as well as to these two. Another thing to be regretted is, that no *principle* has been discovered or talked of. The "small doses" cure; this is what we are told, and this is about all; for, as to the *why* or *wherefore*, as to the *principle* upon which the cure is effected, nothing is said, and we are left fairly in the lurch. The discoverer seems, indeed, to have had a squint at something of the sort when he was writing the words "a strange anomaly;" but, surely, it might have struck his mind that it is amongst the doings of erring mortals we should look for strange anomalies; not in the workings of unthinking matter. However that may be ruled, let us for the present, at least, be content with what we have got; it is not much, to be sure, but it is something; "half a loaf is better than no bread." We have found "small doses" cure; this is something; by and by we may find the principle.

Well, the gentleman has discovered the *uses* of two drugs; for, as to their *abuse*, there was no need to discover *that*. That has been long known and widely practised. Ipecacuanha and Rhubarb, in their gross state, were, I might almost say, shovelled into the stomachs of men, women and children; and then there was an accession of suffering—vomiting and diarrhœa with many other clear indications of poisoning—and this was, and yet is, called the "rational method" of curing. Ah! it is well that we are at length delivered from this "rational" method. We now take "small doses"—doses so small and so prepared, as that the disgusting "sensible qualities" of the drug are not only got rid of, but its benign cura-

tive power developed and applied to the sufferings of grateful humanity.

Here, if anywhere, is the true explanation of that seeming paradox which is in everybody's mouth, but in few men's understanding, namely, that medicine can both "kill and cure." It is not that the same drug and same quantity of it will kill one person and cure another, as the popular and professional blunder has it. No such thing—but that small, or homœopathic doses of a medicine will cure a natural disease which is similar to the artificial one, which large, or allopathic doses of the same medicine are known to produce in healthy persons.

Is it not a wonder that a man belonging to a school of medicine which is guided in almost all its movements by sheer conjecture, should not have seized hold of the notion, from the fact that he had discovered, that, between vomiting, in natural sickness, and Ipecacuanha, God may have established the long unknown relationship of disease and cure; that, possibly, large doses of that drug produced the very sickness of which it was designed that the drug, in small doses, should be the specific remedy; that, as the "strange anomaly" went further, namely, to Rhubarb, it might be that it reached still further yet, in fact, comprehended all drugs; that this relationship might, possibly, be under the government of special laws, to discover which was the chief business of professional men, and that such a course would be more in accordance with a "rational" system of medicine and the lofty pretensions to all the learning, than the giving of drachms and ounces of coarse and nauseous and sickening drugs, on the principle that Thomas had it from Richard, who had it from Henry; that they proved of service in diseases going by the same name as the one in view; or, on the equally enlightened principle, that the drug was *supposed*, from its smell, taste, etc., to be capable of removing the internal obstruction which was *supposed* to exist, and which was *supposed* to be the cause of the present disease? Is it not strange that the gentleman alluded to did not conjecture something of this sort, when he made the discovery which he himself has recorded?

This, perhaps, would be descending to niceties, a practice beneath the dignity of a routine system, rioting in the confidence of

place and power. When a deviation *does* occur, it is deemed better, it seems, to proceed on the principle of further guessing, or of "strange anomalies."

On account of being ignorant of the law of cure, what a fearful system that of Allopathy is! It begins by giving doses so coarse and massive as that sickness, not health, is almost invariably the result; the quantity of each successive dose is then increased, until the violence of the reactive efforts of the organism gives evidence of the approach of death.

How different is Homœopathy. Profiting by the kind hints, as it were, of nature, and borrowing light from the few recorded yet transient sparks of truth which passed across the mental vision of a few great medical men of both ancient and modern times, she has gone to work in the right direction, and, in the main, performed the grand achievement, the honor of which belongs to the immortal Hahnemann.

She proves her medicines, in the first place, on those in perfect health; she notes down, carefully, the sick symptoms that follow; she as carefully preserves the sacred record, for it is the record of such symptoms as, occurring in natural disease, the Giver of all good intended those very medicines, respectively, to cure. She gives small doses; why not, when large ones hurt? Is not a burn cured by a dose of heat smaller than that which caused the burn? Is not the dose of cold which cures a frost bite smaller than the one which caused it? And, as to the diseases, even of the mind, what wise man would not take the heart oppressed with grief to the "house of mourning," rather than to the "house of feasting?" for, surely, it is "better;" the dose here is, indeed, large, but only to those immediately concerned; to the stranger, it comes diluted; for he takes it not so much by actual participation as by contemplation.

There is yet another feature in the quotation, to be noticed. It tells us that small doses of Ipec. will cure "vomiting," and that small doses of Rhubarb will cure *diarrhœa*: but nothing is said of the *sort* of vomiting, or *sort* of diarrhœa, or of the accompanying symptoms. This is in accordance with Allopathy, which is a *generalizing* system, but will not, at all, chime in with

Homœopathy. There are forms of vomiting and many forms of diarrhœa which cannot be cured even by "small doses" of the two drugs mentioned, but, for the cure of which, Homœopathy has the true specifics, I might say, at her fingers' ends.

New York, Sept., 1852.

JUSTICE.

THE QUESTION SETTLED—HOMŒOPATHISTS ANNIHILATED.

C. H. F. Routh, M.D., M.R.C.S., &c., &c., of London, has written a book of 85 pages 8vo., entitled, "On the fallacies of Homœopathy and the imperfect statistical inquiries on which the results of that practice are estimated." This production of Dr. Routh has been favorably reviewed by "The British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review." The gist of the work of Routh and the Review can be stated in few words. They agree that homœopaths are a set of low fellows, with a strong propensity to lying, and of course unworthy of confidence. This is the basis of what Dr. Routh and the Review has to say of Homœopaths. On the contrary they say that allopathists are gentlemen, they love the truth and hate Homœopathy and her practitioners. On this foundation they build, and they do it with ease; for Homœopaths being all liars, their statistics of cures of cholera and other diseases are all false, got up to "humbug" the people, who, Dr. Routh or the Review, we don't remember which, virtually says are asses, and cannot understand figures; but allopathists are all honest, honorable men, and their statistics are worthy of confidence. This embraces the essential part of the publication, and whoever can approve of Routh's reasoning is exceedingly deficient in ordinary mental endowments.

Those most experienced in Homœopathy testify to its great value. Among physicians, those who have studied it thoroughly, and practised it strictly are hardly tempted to resort, under any circumstances, to allopathic measures. If Homœopathy has any truth in it, it is all true; for it is an assemblage of facts, dependent one upon the other, therefore she must be received in whole, or rejected in whole. It is proved that she is adapted to all human maladies, and even in hopeless cases, her power soothes the dying

sufferer in his passage to the world of spirits.

Upon these grounds we do not perceive any reason in the assertion "that Homœopathy is appropriate to some diseases, and not to others." This error has led many to abandon what is true for that which is false.

Allopathic physicians, generally, do not understand Homœopathy, they have never studied it in the only proper way. Simply reading the *ORGANON*, and other works, can never furnish a proper knowledge of Homœopathy. It must be tried in the legitimate way, and one man's experience is not enough to confirm one in that system of medicine; but the combined experience of hundreds places it beyond a doubt.

Allopathists complain of their name—they do not like the word allopathy to designate their mode of practice. But they can never remove the term, it will stick to them. And it should.

THE MEDICAL TREATMENT OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

The London correspondent of the New York Herald, when speaking of the death of the Duke of Wellington, says:—

"After all, a great lesson is afforded by his death to medical practitioners, for though no one supposes it would have done him any good to live any longer, yet he cannot be said to have died from age, but rather from the mistake of the medical men who were about him. A young man of thirty years treated in the same way, would have succumbed under the treatment. The Duke was subject to epileptic fits, and, as is well known to those who have had experience in the matter, such fits are intimately connected with the stomach, and are preceded by a sense of a load at that region. This sensation is the prelude to the fit, and should be met with stimulants, to keep off the spasmodic action which brings on the fit. The medical men, however, took no notice of the Duke's complaint, who attributed his sense of weight at the stomach to mere indigestion; a good dose of ether or brandy, or some other diffusive stimulant, would have set all to rights; but the doctor took no notice, and ordered him tea and toast. Then, again, afterwards, when the old Duke began to shiver with the epileptic fit, they gave him emetics, which were quite enough to kill him, and he died. Age has nothing to do with the immediate cause of death; for it

a man fall into a ditch and break his bones, and people stand on the edge of the ditch and pummel him to death, it would not signify whether the man was young or old; he must die, if he were not carefully and properly lifted out of the ditch. No doubt the excessive anxiety of medical men, in the cases of the high and noble, operates to lead their judgment astray. Sir Robert Peel was sacrificed in this way, out of pure delicacy, for the surgeons did not know what or where the fracture was, till he was dead. They were afraid to disturb him by examining where he was wounded by his fall. There is something of a lesson in all these things."

It is a much more serious matter for a great man to become sick, than for others. Not only may the Duke be an instance, but such cases have been numerous in this country. No doubt Washington died prematurely from the treatment he received from his physicians. And the same is also believed in the cases of several of our Presidents and Senators. Yet we do not blame the physicians, for they performed their duties faithfully according to the theories of the allopathic school. The fault is not in the practitioner, but in the practice. Whoever, in this day, submits to allopathic treatment in any of its thousand forms, should attach no stigma to those who treat them, but the blame is with themselves. They close their eyes to the light which exposes the pernicious tendencies of allopathic measures.

It is remarkable how blindly indifferent most persons are to the kind of medical treatment they adopt. In all the business affairs of life, a thorough investigation is had, all the facts are duly considered, and great care is taken that the reasoning is based upon the facts proved by experiment, so that mistakes may be avoided. The modern motto is practically adopted, "Be sure you are right, then go ahead." But this is not the case in medicine. In that there is a belief in what is absurd. The most unreasonable promises of the openly avowed quack, the more refined and dignified pretensions of the diplomated empiric, acting upon minds inclined to believe, on no rational basis, in omens and prognostics, as coming directly from a supernatural agency, influence thousands to jeopardise their health and life. But we trust the period is at hand when the people will become rationally considerate on the important subject of

medicine, that they may avoid that which is evil, and pursue that which is good.

REMARKS ON A RULE OF THE "CODE OF ETHICS" OF THE "AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION."

The following is extracted from the code of ethics of the "American Medical Association:"—

"No one can be considered as a regular practitioner, or a fit associate in consultation, whose practice is based on an *exclusive dogma*, to the rejection of the accumulated experience of the profession, and of the aids actually furnished by anatomy, physiology, pathology, and organic chemistry."

The above Association was organised a few years ago, and designed to embrace every diplomated allopathic physician in these United States. It holds its meetings annually, and heretofore the attendance has been large, almost every state and county being represented. This Association is, therefore, the highest authority in the country of the allopathic school, and whatever emanates from it should be regarded as the voice of that school.

The "American Medical Association," at the time of its organisation, appointed a committee of its ablest members to prepare a system of rules for regulating the conduct of its members, and dignified it by the term, "Code of Ethics;" in which may be found the above extract, which we propose briefly to examine. That rule was intended to reach homœopathic practitioners. It is a vain attempt to place these in the public mind among quacks and ignorant pretenders to medical knowledge. It may be regarded as a "BULL," fulminated by the great medical congress of allopathists in this country. It is proper, therefore, that we should look into it and see how far it is applicable against what it may be aimed.

But for the painful ignorance on the subject that is manifested by these gentlemen who constitute the American Medical Association, we could scarcely suppose that it was peculiarly directed against practitioners of Homœopathy.

The word "*dogma*," in the above extract, means a doctrinal notion in medicine. How far does Homœopathy come within

this definition? Homœopathy claims to be a law in therapeutics; and by such law we mean the inherent principle by which the disordered functions of the human body are restored to their healthy condition; or in other words, the law of cure. As well might the great law of gravitation, which governs and controls the globe we live in, and the myriads of worlds above us, be stigmatised an "exclusive dogma" because it is based, like Homœopathy, upon a well ascertained natural law, and call it "exclusive" because it is well defined and simple, like all the great principles of nature.

Homœopathy is no "exclusive dogma." It is a principle synthetically established by the accumulated experience of physicians from Hippocrates to the present time, and fully developed by the great Hahnemann.

It is the great law by which drugs cure; and such being the case the homœopathic physician cannot vary from it. As well might the engineer, in calculating the distance which his projectiles would fall, reject as too exclusive the law of gravitation.

Is it right to say we adhere to an "exclusive dogma" when we adopt nature's own law to the exclusion of the vagaries and fine-spun theories of the human intellect—the empirical practice—the doctrines of this or that man who may happen to be a little above his fellows. If by this is meant "the rejection of the accumulated experience of the profession," homœopaths are honored thereby. Those who understand Homœopathy would not insinuate that her practitioners reject "the aids actually furnished by anatomy, physiology, pathology and organic chemistry." Her *materia medica* is based upon anatomy, physiology and pathology, and in a sense too, far more extensive and exact than is dreamed of by the combined knowledge of the American Medical Association. When a genuine homœopathist examines a case of disease, of necessity the above three branches must come in, they cannot be kept out. When he seeks the remedy by the *Materia Medica*, again the same three branches come in, they cannot be excluded. On a thorough examination of this subject it will be found that the homœopathic system is the only one that makes a suitable use of anatomy, physiology, and pathology. As it regards

"organic chemistry," it has been so recently promulgated, that, as yet, neither allopathists nor homœopathists know how to use it for curative purposes. The rule from the "code of ethics," upon a fair construction, does not reach homœopathists, as was intended, and we really do regret that the combined knowledge of the whole allopathic school in this country, should have exposed so much ignorance in so few words; and that that school should so unwisely make such exorbitant claims of rank and dignity; and that it should presume so much on its influence on the public mind, for the purpose of preventing all reform in the art of medicine, unless it tends to perpetuate the confidence of the people in Allopathy. We say we deeply regret all this, for it has more the aspect of a party of politicians seeking places of honor and emolument, than the humble, honest, industrious, persevering seekers after truth.

HOMŒOPATHIC CONGRESS.

The third annual meeting of homœopathic physicians was held in Edinburgh on the third and fourth of last month. Dr. Henderson, Professor of Pathology in the Edinburgh (allopathic) University, was unanimously elected chairman, who opened the Congress with the following remarks, as reported in the "Homœopathic Times":—

"Gentlemen, I thank you cordially for having placed me in the chair on this occasion, for I esteem it a very great honor, indeed, to be called on to preside at the first Homœopathic Congress held in my native country. We have, I think, reason to congratulate ourselves that so many have been able to attend at this Congress; and, I think, we have evidence of the interest taken in this subject in the circumstance of so many coming from distant parts of the country to be present amongst us. The institution of scientific associations, for the purpose of meeting periodically at different places, may be regarded as peculiar to this busy, enterprising age, and the purposes they serve are both important and manifold. If they do not actually plant the lamp of science where its light had been previously unknown, they at least refresh it with oil, and make it burn the brighter in the places they visit. They awaken a public interest—a popular interest in the progress of useful knowledge, more than local, stationary, and more familiar societies usually do; and

by bringing together laborers from different parts of the fields of science and from different countries, they quicken the interchange of new truths, and enliven their devotion to their favorite studies by affording them opportunities of intercourse with persons of different tastes. These advantages are common to all such associations, but our advantage is peculiar to ourselves in the existing circumstances of our profession, and, indeed, of medical science itself. I have no intention either to deprecate the hostility of those who treat us with bitterness and misrepresentation, or of entering into any detail on the subject. I advert merely to that speciality in our own condition, which makes meetings like this peculiarly pleasant and profitable. Scattered as we are, each in our own place, singly, or in small companies, over the three kingdoms, exposed everywhere to the treatment I have referred to, it is exceedingly encouraging and delightful to behold, as on this occasion, so many who maintain the same just principles—so many whose names are familiar to us as the defenders of those great truths, which we all know from experience to be by far the most important in the whole range of medicine. 'As iron sharpeneth iron, so does the countenance of a man that of his friend,' is a proverb the truth of which must be felt by all of us on an occasion like this. I feel satisfied that when this Congress is dispersed, each will return to the sphere of his arduous and responsible avocations with a zeal and a resolution strengthened by the opportunity he has had of personal intercourse with so many that hold the same great principles in medicine, and have the same experience as himself. As you are about to be addressed on some important and interesting topics connected with the present position and prospects of our science, I shall not trespass further on your time, but before sitting down, I again thank you for the honor conferred on me."

We notice with regret that some of the members fell into the too common error of physicians, of generalizing from a single case. To assume a general rule of practice in medicine from the result of one or a few cases is not sound reasoning; and if so, of course should be avoided, especially by those who are seeking such a reform in medicine as will establish a true healing art.

If it could be proved beyond a doubt that allopathic measures are indispensable to cure any case of disease, a foundation would be laid for an argument against Homœopathy that could not be answered easily.

The "Times" pertinently asks: "Why should we not all imitate the experience of

the Master before we begin to dogmatise and theorise? Is he unworthy of credence?"

"It is strange, passing strange," that before Hahnemann's disciples have had time to properly repeat his experiments—before they have tested his practice in the only way, by doing as he did, some of them set about a modification of it, and try, in some instances, to make it appear to simulate as much as possible its opposite—Allopathy. One would suppose that he who has only a limited knowledge of Homœopathy would at once perceive the absurdity of such an attempt.

We place before our readers the observations of Dr. Prince, by which the character of a debate that sprung up in the Congress may be understood. We do not concur with Dr. P. in all he is made to say, but still his remarks as a whole are valuable:

"Mr. President: Sir, I am loth to let the members retire without first giving my sentiments on the subject which occupied them at the beginning of the *séance*, namely, the use of 'auxiliaries' in the application of the science of Homœopathy. I am prepared to admit that, in the present condition of our *Materia Medica*, and the very limited sum of provings compared with the fulness of the treasury of remedial agencies which are doubtless comprised within the productions of the kingdoms of nature, we must expect to be baffled in the treatment of diseases which, bye-and-bye, when that treasury has been more diligently explored and tested, will be found to be curable: yet I cannot but say I have been painfully affected and mortified by the admissions which have been made by some of the best experienced of the present assembly of those deficiencies. Having espoused the Hahnemannian law of therapeutics these four years, after a vetustan experiment of the inglorious uncertainties of the ancient ways, I feel jealous for the maintenance and furtherance of the credit of it, and quite averse to be taking myself again to those labyrinths of tormenting dubiety, from out of which I have been guided by the happy discovery of our noble founder. At no time of my brief course of homœopathic practice have I had recourse to any description of auxiliary; what success I have had has been achieved by a faithful adherence to the doctrines of the New School, and those gifted and much-experienced practitioners by whom I was initiated have also, I believe, uniformly observed the foundation-principle of our practice.

"I grieve to contemplate the possible results of an authorization of the use of 'auxiliaries,' so called; by the timid, by the in-

dolent, and by the imperfectly-inducted professors of Homœopathy, recourse will be taken hastily to them, and even the ambition and ardor of the more sincere and qualified for an extension and additions to our provings may be moderated, and thus our better art will be disparaged and retarded, and ultimately be debased into a mere adjunct to the ancient system of treatment that has now begun to decline, and would possibly sink into desuetude in the ratio of the rising prosperity of its honorable rival, if this were, as it should be, fostered zealously and faithfully.

"Imperfect as our resources are at present, I could not indiscriminately condemn every use of means not strictly homœopathic, though, should I be in the dilemma supposed, and be actuated according to the present impulse of my mind, I would prefer to acknowledge the perplexity, and, if no other homœopathy was at hand, to give the patient the choice of transfer into the charge of a declared practitioner of the Old School. It may be urged that the main duty of the physician is to relieve or cure his patient; but then let him use only those means which he is assured will effect the one or other of those ends without the infliction of an ulterior injury on the sufferer.

"Finality and imperfection pertain to the understanding and works of man, wherefore he may often fail in the application of the truthful principles of nature; and, as respects the subject of remark, I have this consolation, Mr. Chairman, that the law of 'let like be treated with like' has neither been questioned nor falsified by those gentlemen who have here confessed to an occasional obligation to meet an urgent necessity by means not known to be referable to that law.

"I have felt constrained to advance these remarks, rather than to let the advocacy of the latitudinarian practice pass *namine contradicente*, and without protesting against what I conceive likely to damage the integrity and progress of our medical reform."

Nearly forty physicians and surgeons, with chemists, attended the Congress, and nearly fifty practitioners sent letters of apology for their absence.

The next meeting of the Congress will be held in Manchester, August, 1853, which, from its central position, will, no doubt, attract a large gathering.

THE DINNER.

At six, the greater portion of the members of Congress, with the addition of a number of friends, among whom we noticed James Simpson, Esq., Advocate, the well-known friend of popular education, Mr. Russell, Advocate, and Mr. Stewart, of the *Edinburgh News*, assembled to dinner. The

dining-hall of the Hopetoun Rooms was elegantly fitted up, and the dinner of the most *recherché* and, at the same time, most substantial description; quite a contrast to the tawdry, gingerbread decoration and overdressed leanness of the Soyer dinner last year. Professor Henderson occupied the chair, and Dr. Black the vice-chair. A choice choir of glee-singers attended, and enlivened the proceedings by the performance of an appropriate and well-selected number of glees and madrigals.

The CHAIRMAN, who was supported on his right and left by Mr. Frith, of London, and Dr. Drysdale, of Liverpool, after having proposed the usual loyal and national toasts, rose and said: "I have now to propose what, in the social meetings of our body, has ever justly been regarded as the great toast of the evening—the 'Memory of Hahnemann.' I confess I feel no small measure of diffidence in approaching the subjects suggested by the toast, for, on mentioning the memory of Hahnemann, it is impossible not to advert, however briefly, to those great qualities and great achievements which made his name by far the most illustrious in the annals of medicine. Medicine, as you know, is partly made up of contributions from various sciences, and can claim, as exclusively its own, only the science of disease, pathology, and the science of cure, or therapeutics. These two sciences are sacred to the physician; and it is on the field of the one or the other that his peculiar fame must be sought, and his monument be reared. It may be unnecessary to remark, that both pathology and therapeutics had a being, such as it was, in all ages; but it is only of late, nearly, indeed, within the present century, that they have ceased to be almost entirely fanciful, fictitious, and groundless. The names of men deservedly famous for their genius and learning do indeed adorn the previous history of both; but I believe it is doing no injustice to them to say, that their labors in pathology and therapeutics are rather an entertainment to the antiquary, than useful or instructive to the physician. The last half century has witnessed a great change. Pathology, if it cannot boast of a single law, aspiring to explain and comprehend all the phenomena of disease, like the successive theories of former days, is yet rich in sound principles and accurate operations; and, if it has no master-mind to rule successive generations of admiring disciples, has many assiduous cultivators who constantly add to its treasures. How different is the case with the other science, as more generally believed in and practiced! It is admitted by those who do not rank among us—by the best informed of them, at least—that their therapeutics (I use their own language) 'is of all medical sciences the most unsettled and unsatisfactory in its present state, and the

least advanced in its progress.' If we can justly and gladly utter a far different judgment of our therapeutics, the memory of Samuel Hahnemann can never be mentioned among us without affectionate and admiring gratitude. And well may he be admired! When we consider the chaos of false principles and false opinion, of time-honored prejudices and erroneous convictions, that overlaid, disfigured, and concealed the *true* in therapeutics—the wisdom and sagacity, the intellectual power and daring, of the man who discovered and drew it forth, and who labored so long and so bravely to place it where it ought to be, appear altogether unequalled in the history of any science, of any country, or of any age. He stands alone as the great master of the science and art of therapeutics, and he will ever stand alone; for although much must yet be added to his researches which will make his discovery of the great law of cure more and more a blessing to mankind with every successive year, still, as the discoverer of the law, and of the principal requisites for carrying it into practical effect, Hahnemann must ever stand far apart from even the most successful of his followers—alone in his glory. We are not so solicitous to claim for Hahnemann a high place in pathology. Pathology was not his vocation; yet, if this were the proper place and time, I could prove from his writings that he had not merely glimpses, but even distinct though partial views of some of the most important truths of modern pathology long before they had caught the eyes of other men. For these reasons, and for his attainments in chemistry, so considerable for the time in which he lived, as well as for his classical lore and general learning, which would have been remarkable in a man of any period, Hahnemann, had he never discovered the great law of therapeutics, would still have been ranked as one of the most notable men of his day. We have to do only with his public, his scientific character and doings; but I cannot deny myself the pleasure of taking a single glance at his private virtues. From the lips of those who knew him personally, we hear but one voice of praise and loving admiration of the man and the friend; and his writings abound, as no other scientific writings do, with utterances of that piety and benevolence which we are assured pervaded his conversation and his conduct. While on the subject, it has occurred to me, that those who come after us will be apt to blame us, who live so near his times, if we neglect the opportunities we enjoy of collecting from those who had the honor of his friendship whatever may be worthy of being preserved regarding him; and I think it would be desirable for this or for the next Congress to devise some way by which these particulars might be gathered ere the opportunity pass away

for ever. But whatever be your decision on this point, there can be but one sentiment among us in commemorating the greatest of physicians."

The toast was drunk in solemn silence.

Dr. SUTHERLAND, on proposing the "Progress of Medical Science," said: "It is not my purpose to trace the history of that science from the days of Hippocrates. Were I to do so, I would necessarily fall back to the garden of Eden, where disease first entered the human family, and by its side arose the remedy, for no disease exists without its appropriate cure. But without detaining you in this manner, there are two points which I will just allude to. These comprise all that has been done towards the advancement of medical science. The subject of diagnosis is equally applicable to Allopathy or Homoeopathy. Of this science of diagnosis, the stethoscope may be said to make up the one-half and the microscope the other half—the one is the right hand and the other the left hand of the physician. But, besides the beautifully-elaborated system of diagnosis, we have now obtained a guide in the art of healing which we had not before. That law has been enunciated by Samuel Hahnemann—a man who, notwithstanding the great benefits he has conferred on the human race, has been covered with obloquy after his death. These two points embrace all that is interesting in the subject either to the profession or the public; and I beg to give the 'Progress of Medical Science.'"

Dr. RUSSELL, in proposing the "University of Edinburgh, and their distinguished chairman, Professor Henderson," adverted in happy terms to the uses of such an institution, and the loss sustained by society in general, when, by the ignorance or mismanagement of its Directors, or the neglect of the public, any injury was done to it. He characterized the treatment of Mr. Pope, by the body of Examiners, as highly disgraceful, and calculated to inflict a deep injury on the University.

The CHAIRMAN acknowledged the toast, as follows: "I beg to thank you most sincerely for the honor you have now done to the University to which I belong, and to my name in connection with it. It would be indelicate, and it would be improper, in me to advert to several of the topics which were in their proper place alluded to by Dr. Russell. All I shall say in reference to the University is simply this, that we must learn to make much allowance for men who have been suddenly placed in unprecedented circumstances. Much may have been done which more mature reflection and experience, if it could have been possessed, would have prevented; and with this remark I dismiss the subject. With regard to myself, I have no doubt that many who have heard of our late controversies in this city, re-

garded the whole as in a great degree very much more formidable to those who were in the thickest of it than we actually felt. If the controversy had elicited nothing more than this, I for my part would rejoice that it took place, namely, that never had a controversy of the same kind taught us how strong public feeling was in all matters relating to conscience and duty. We felt strengthened by the conviction that the public of this country—whether they coincided in our peculiar opinions or not—were entirely at one with us on this point; that we should have a fair field and fair play. That they have secured to us, and as long as that is preserved, I need not assure you I shall endeavor to do my duty in the hour of trial and the hour of difficulty."

The next toast, "The Homœopathic Institutions in Great Britain," was proposed by the CHAIRMAN, accompanied with the following remarks: "We have now (he said), in almost every town where Homœopathy is established, dispensaries, and of hospitals there are two in London and one in Manchester. I will say nothing as to their management or the prosperity of their funds; but it occurs to me that I may be allowed to make a few observations on the subject, in consideration that I myself spent fifteen years of my life as hospital physician in one of these admirable institutions. It has occurred to me that size was one element in hospitals not less important to their efficiency and success—in one important particular, at least,—than good management and plenty of funds. No doubt the benefits to the poor from hospital institutions may be in some measure secured by even smaller institutions; but then this benefit is not incompatible with that liberal arrangement for clinical instruction, which can alone be afforded in large hospitals, where sound and learned practitioners can only be found. I do think it has been a great mistake on the part of our friends that they did not institute one great hospital instead of two small hospitals in London, for now, at this early stage of the development of the system, Homœopathy cannot maintain more than one great hospital. There may be more than one eventually, but for some time it will be more for the advantage of the progress of Homœopathy to have only one large hospital, to which students might resort with the hope and certainty of having in the study of their profession the means of obtaining an insight into all the varieties of disease. With this toast I couple the health of Dr. Dudgeon; and were he not connected with the metropolitan hospitals, he would still have a strong claim on a meeting of this kind. We owe him much for his labors as a journalist, and his contributions to the progress of our science. We owe him much for being the able translator of so many valuable works of our Great Master. He

has thus done great benefit to our science, by bringing our Master's doctrines within the knowledge of all, which could not have been the case, if the works had been locked up in the language of his native country."

Dr. DUDGEON returned thanks.

Mr. RUSSELL, advocate, gave the toast of "The Press." He said, that before they could have patients, and procure the enlargement and extension of their science, they must, through means of the press, inject into the public mind more fully, and with greater confidence, those colors which were to give it a tint. There was, however, some danger of the scientific literature, because of the fewness of its patrons, becoming too popular, and, on the other hand, of the popular literature becoming too scientific. Now, it was obviously of great importance that the scientific should be as scientific as possible; and the *Journal of Homœopathy* served this purpose, while they had the *Homœopathic Times*, which was of a more popular character. It was impossible to overestimate the value of such works in this controversy. He concluded by giving "The Press," coupled with the health of Mr. STEWART, of the *Edinburgh News*.

Mr. STEWART, of the *Edinburgh News*, returned thanks very briefly.

Mr. SIMPSON, advocate, being called on by the Chairman for a toast, gave "The Freedom of Opinion." Mr. Simpson delivered an eloquent speech on this important subject, and concluded by connecting with the sentiment, "The exiles for free opinion now present."

The toast was drunk with great enthusiasm, and Dr. WIELOBYCKI, of Edinburgh, returned thanks in an able speech.

Dr. FEARON proposed "Foreign Congresses."

Dr. WALKER, of Manchester, proposed the "Homœopathic Chemists," coupled with the names of the chemists present: Messrs. Walker, London; Turner, Manchester; Clifton, Northampton; and Allshorn and Brown, Edinburgh.

The health of Drs. Russell and Wielobycki, the Secretaries of the Congress, was then drunk, and the meeting separated, having previously sung the Scottish parting of "Auld Lang Syne."

ON THE OBSERVATIONS OF NATURE IN THE TREATMENT OF DISEASE.

BY ANDREW COMBE, M. D.

Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, one of the Physicians in Ordinary in Scotland, to the Queen, &c., &c.

In laying before our readers the letter of Dr. A. Combe to his brother, George Combe, Esq., we do not intend thereby to endorse

the views therein expressed on the effects in man of the laws of Nature in health and sickness; but it contains evidence of a strong love of truth, of great liberality of feeling, of clear perceptions of the deficiencies of the allopathic system, and important suggestions to his own school (allopathic), etc., which seems to us might be read with profit by some of our bigoted allopathic brethren of this country.

Edinburgh, 8th January, 1842.

"MY DEAR GEORGE.—The great defect in the study of medicine, and in all investigations connected with it, at present, seems to me to consist in the nearly total absence of guiding principles, and in the neglect of the great rules of Bacon, and more especially of the *observation of nature*, as the only solid foundation on which medicine or any other science can rest and advance towards perfection. This last will seem to many of my brethren a very singular charge, because if there is one circumstance on which the profession prides itself more than another at this moment, it is on the ardour with which observation is pursued and facts are sought for. Nevertheless, I believe the charge to be supported by incontrovertible evidence, and I attribute the small progress really made to this very truth. I admit that, everywhere, observations are made and facts stored up with an industry, accuracy, and zeal, which, under better guidance, would soon accomplish great things. But these observations and facts are incomplete, and therefore partial, and, if relied upon, apt to mislead. They are *phenomena or occurrences* rather than ultimate facts, and, their conditions and relations remaining unknown and unconsidered, they lead to no useful results. Hence the multitude of observations daily recorded in the writings of medical men serve more to oppress the memory and puzzle the inquiring mind, than to advance science and improve practice. Hence, too, the thousand and one facts of the one year disappear under the shade of the thousand and one newer facts of the succeeding year. *All*, indeed, are not of this description. Some few out of the many are *complete* facts, and have a meaning which becomes daily brighter, and bears a direct relation to practice. The sum of these constitutes the real amount of the progress made by medical science, and the proverbial uncertainty of medicine affords a pretty accurate indication of the relative amount of incomplete or false facts gathered into the granary.

"The grand object of medicine is to preserve and restore the healthy action of all the different organs and functions of the human body, so as to ensure their efficiency, and fit the individual for the successful

discharge of the duties devolving upon him as a created being and a member of society. Here, then, the first step to be taken is obviously to become acquainted with the mechanism of the body, the structure of its constituent organs, the conditions or laws under which these act, the purposes which they respectively serve in the animal economy, and the relations in which they stand to each other, and to the external agents by which man is surrounded and acted upon from the moment of conception down to his latest breath. In other words, the first step towards rational principles of cure must consist in a *knowledge of the laws of the healthy functions*. The second ought to be the observation of the manner in which the various disturbing causes act upon the different functions, and the *kind, course, duration, and termination*, of the morbid action which they produce. Having investigated these points, we become qualified to inquire, in the next place, what circumstances will best favour the intentions of nature, and remove the obstacles which may have arisen to impede or thwart her efforts. To succeed in these aims, or even to make a rational attempt at succeeding, we must be profoundly impressed, or I may say *saturated*, with the great principle or truth, that all the operations and actions of the living body, whether healthy or morbid, take place according to *fixed and discoverable laws*, and that God has left nothing to chance. With this grand fact before us, it becomes palpably evident that we can do nothing rational, in the way of either prevention or cure, except in so far as we act in accordance with these laws. Many medical men have, however, a very different impression from this. A good physician will always seek to be, and never aim at being more than, Bacon's '*servant and interpreter of nature*.' A greater than he created man and ordained the laws of his being, and no surer road can be found than that traced by the hand of his Creator. Overlooking this truth, and viewing disease as an entity ungoverned by any definite laws, and not destined to run through any definite course, many medical men talk as familiarly of their '*curing*' and '*arresting disease*' as if they had an absolute control over the whole animal functions, and could alter their laws of action at pleasure. To my mind, no clearer proof of presumption and philosophic ignorance can be found than this usurpation of the prerogatives of Deity; and its results are often very unsatisfactory.

"That there are forms of disease in which a determinate nature and course cannot be easily traced, is quite true; but there *are* many more in which the natural course is as obvious as that of the suns. Take the familiar example of cow-pox, small-pox, fever, or ague. The disease is regulated by fixed laws in such a palpable manner, that every

medical book describes with perfect accuracy the appearances which each will present on given days of its progress in an average constitution. The same holds with measles, scarlatina, and many other acute affections; and less clearly, but still perceptibly enough, with gout, rheumatism, and inflammation. All of these go through a regular course, in a shorter or longer time; and when everything goes according to rule, we feel assured that the constitution is safer than where some unusual accident has interrupted the natural progress of events. This, be it observed, is the course towards health which the Creator, in constituting man, considered best for him; and the wisest thing we can do is to act in accordance with it, and seek only to remove impediments. It is not we to whom the cure is intrusted, or by whom it is effected. The Creator has perfected all the arrangements for that purpose, and our sole business ought to be to give these arrangements full play. Man, however, is too full of his own importance to view things in this light. He wishes to be master and to control disease by his own act, and accordingly he has in all ages been seeking for the means of 'arresting' disease at its onset. Not many years ago, the cold affusion was in this way in high vogue for cutting short fever, and its praises were loudly sounded. Gregory applied it even in scarlet fever, and I rather think in measles. In many cases nature was so far vanquished, by repeated cold drenching, that the disease was apparently cut short during the commotion, and (probably from relief being obtained through another channel) without visible bad effects. But in many more, nature stood firm, and additional mischief was added to the original evil, in the shape of affections of internal organs, which ended fatally. Now affusion is laid aside, and its legitimate substitute, tepid or cool sponging of the surface, is usefully employed, because in harmony with the natural course of events.

Here, then, is a type or standard to guide us to the correct investigation of nature in other less determinate affections. Is it not presumable that they also have a certain nature, and course, and termination, which it would be well for us to observe and promote? Take even a severe cold, with which all are acquainted more or less. Everybody knows that when once set in, treat it how you like, it will run through a determinate course of increase, maturity, and decline, and that all we can do is to shorten a little the duration of its stages by diminishing its intensity; or lengthen it by increasing its severity. Occasionally, it is true, an incipient cold may be stopped by a 'heroic' remedy, such as a tumbler of warm punch at bed-time; but much more frequently the heroics leave the patient worse than they found him, and the common experience of

mankind shrinks from their use. Even a common boil on the fingers runs through its regular stages of inflammation and decline, or of suppuration and ulceration, each stage being hastened or retarded by external or constitutional causes, but never inverted. But if we apply to the one stage the means which are adapted only to the succeeding one, the result will be injurious; or if we lower the system so much that it becomes inadequate to carry on the regular succession of actions required for recovery, mischief must once more be produced. Let us take a case of pleurisy in an individual of average strength as an example. We know that, in ordinary circumstances, the excitement goes on increasing during a period varying from two to five or six days; that effusion of fluid into the cavity of the pleura ensues, that the inflammation then begins to abate, and after a few days more passes into an inactive state; that the natural action of the part then begins to be restored, and the fluid to be absorbed, till by and by recovery is completed. Or, if the inflammation endangers life, it either goes on longer than usual, or gives rise to effusion of a quality and quantity incompatible with recovery, and death at last ensues. In a case of average severity in a healthy constitution, left simply to the quiet and abstinence which nature almost compels, we know, from observation, that such are the stages by which recovery is brought about; and all that the physician need attempt or care for is to use every precaution to prevent excitement from running too high or going on too long, and to meet any contingencies which may interfere and impede recovery.

"Very different, however, is the general course of proceeding. Relying on the testimony of an incomplete fact (viz., that blood-letting produces excellent effects in inflammation, without attending sufficiently to the influence of the *adjuvantia*), the moment the practitioner ascertains the existence of 'inflammation,' he pulls out his lancet and bleeds the patient copiously. The oppressed vessels being thus partially emptied, much relief is experienced, and both patient and physician are pleased with the hope that the disease will be 'cut short.' This we shall suppose to have happened at the end of twenty-four or forty-eight hours, or first third of the ascending stage of the inflammation.

(To be continued.)

For the American Journal of Homœopathy.

MR. EDITOR: On looking over the 12th No. of the American Magazine a few days since, my attention was arrested by a most remarkable case of cure by goosegrease. The case is quoted from the Northwestern

Journal of Homœopathy, as seen on 381st page of the magazine. The editor of the Northwestern Journal seems himself unable to account for the wonderful curative effects of goosegrease in a most inveterate case of asthma which had withstood the most persevering use of all other remedies known to him. Now this whole matter is easily explained, and we may as well help the poor fellow out of his dilemma by advising him to change the name of his Journal to *Northwestern Journal, devoted to Homœopathy and Goosegreaseopathy*, so as to have it in keeping with the wide-open and noisy mouthpiece of the Western College of Homœopathy and Hydropathic Medicine at Cleveland. Now is it not plain that by putting gooseopathy at the end of goosegrease the whole matter is cleared up in such a way, as to leave no doubt upon the mind with regard to the *modus operandi* of said grease! Most certainly. This case was quoted by the editors of the American Magazine to show up their literary backing, and fortify themselves in their eclectic position in medical science and Therapeutics. They are welcome to all the benefit derivable from such authority or such reported causes. And they may have all the glory now by such uncalled-for *metaphysical* flagellations as that given by them to a consistent Homœopath who very modestly says, on page 357, of Magazine. "I am well pleased with the merry things it contains (Magazine), but can by no means endorse all its sentiments. I consider the LAW SIMILIA to be one of Nature's laws, and consequently it must be perfect. No remedy, then, should be recognised as a system, and if water be applied only in accordance with this law, and only when applied in this way, can it be beneficial, we have nothing more, still, than Homœopathy, pure Homœopathy. I am as much in favor of introducing new remedies into our materia medica as any one can be, but to recognise any one as a system I must forever remain opposed. How unlike the goosegrease talk—and yet the *goosegrease* Dr. is met with a smile of approbation and pride, whilst this consistent man of science and system is pitched about fore and aft, without mercy, by the champions of eclecticism, who believe in more than one law of cure; for instance, the homœopathic

kinesetherapeutic; homœopathic, goosegreaseopathic, and as many more as there are curative agents in nature. The editors of the Magazine complain that they have never had a point presented by their opponents at which they could aim before, and surely if they, in the long and windy article under the head of "*But one law of cure*," are aiming at their text, they have shown themselves bad marksmen, for they have hit everything around the text whilst it is left untouched.

I wish, Mr. Editor, to call their attention to the text, the point, by the following interrogations. Would you, Messrs. Editors of the Magazine, advise Mr. Editor of the Northwestern Journal, to change the name of his paper to The Northwestern Journal, devoted to *Homœopathy and Goosegreaseopathy*? If so you may vindicate your own consistency. If not, how will you defend your *hydropathic* enterprise?

Dr. —, whose short letter appears on page 357 of the Magazine, says nothing about the value or uses of water; I am not aware that its uses, as an important and indispensable agent in the treatment of the sick, have been gainsaid by the pure homœopaths, or "system-mongers" as they are called by the Magazine, in contradistinction to true physicians, who "look with open eyes" and go through the world with "receptive souls," and only ask, when they see anything, whether it is one of "God's great truths," in order to comprehend it fully.

I hope this point will not be dodged by the editors of the Magazine; but met and shot at fairly, with all the intellectual artillery. Water is good for men and cattle, whether sick or well. Independently of its diluent and cleansing properties, it exerts a powerful influence over the vital economy by virtue of its temperature, compared with the temperature of the system. If its temperature corresponds to that of the system it produces no effects whatever, except by virtue of its diluent and cleansing qualities. Evaporation may and does affect the temperature of the body, but aside from these water is without effect. In view of the effects of water, temperatureopathy would rather express its mode of operation; but let Messrs. Editors vindicate their peculiar notions, and answer to the points before them. Will you, Mr. Editor, give them the

benefit of a mark to shoot at by publishing the above, and oblige

Your Obedient Servant,

D. M. DAKK, M.D.

Pittsburg, Pa., September, 1852.

WORDS TO THE WISE.

There is a spirit-depth in every human being, if he will attend to it. We homœopathists have been charged with knavery or folly. But the honest among us, who have the consciousness of that spirit-depth, declare we are innocent of knavery and unconscious of folly—we declare what we believe to be true. Can our adversaries, unscrupulous though they be, say more for themselves?

This is the law of conscience, the natural law written in the heart of every human being. We declare that we are honest in our therapeutical faith, according to our convictions. Can our gainsayers say more?

It would be dishonest, criminal, homicidal, to pretend to use means for the cure of disease, which in our consciences we believed to be ineffectual. Have we not as much right to be believed as our opponents? We say we have. We lay no claim to the *a priori* argument; we rest on experiments and experience.

In one sense, small, very small indeed, is the highest intellect of the most nobly endowed of men. In one sense, all men are equal; for all are immeasurably little when compared with infinite space, and infinite space is immeasurably little when compared with the Creator.

We wish to give a moral elevation to those who profess our doctrine and practice—our *better way*, as we have called it. We are not stocks nor stones; we are not insensible to taunts and sarcasms; we have not the hide of the rhinoceros.

Those may hold it foul scorn, who know that they have enjoyed all the advantages of education that any of their opponents have done—that they may claim the distinctions of the scholar, the gentleman, and physician—that they are, notwithstanding, subjected not only to the petty annoyances of open foes, but to the misprison even of some of those who should be their warmest supporters and most devoted advocates.

During not a few years some have waged the battle of homœopathy bravely, boldly, confidently, and hopefully. They have given time, brain, intellect to their task—how have they been recompensed?

For such there are, however, solaces and hopes in their murkiest days and in their darkest nights. The nightingale, after all, is a bird with a cheerful note.

We live out our time and we pass away, but the merest word, the most simple aspiration for truth, remains for ever. Remove the Alpine range! that is a far easier task

than to expunge the most feeble sigh for truth. It reverberates through space; it excites a magnetic influence throughout the universe.

It is precisely because of their independence of party, and on account of their self-respect, and thorough independence of this or that *clique*, that some may have pleased no party. But they need not give themselves any trouble or uneasiness on this score.

"The simple believeth every word, but the prudent man looketh well to his going." This is one of the proverbs of King Solomon, and is very applicable to us homœopathists in our controversy with dominant allopathy. It must be conceded to some of us medical homœopathists of Great Britain, that we are men of good birth and breeding, of good education, and of good principles, as the world goes; some of our number have been as highly educated as any Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, it may be that a few have been even better educated. Why should such men, in good practice, with all the rewards that allopathy can afford, have adopted Homœopathy, except from conviction?

The older members of the allopathic body are suspicious of innovation; their credulity abates as they get older; they learn to lose faith in their own doctrine and practice. The younger of that body have hope and confidence; they have not yet been down-beaten by the consciousness of perpetual failure. They still believe what they have learned in the schools, and fondly fancy that the products of disease revealed by the scalpel, and called *morbid anatomy*, may be as guides to them in the treatment of disease; they are instructed to believe that the microscope may assist them in these pathological researches: but the *victim is dead*. They want the touch of Prometheus to show them *how* disease, in this or that part, began; how it made progress; how and why it terminated fatally. We take it, neither scalpel nor microscope can teach them such knowledge. They find that out after a time.

Several cases of hydrophobia have been cured by homœopathy, and one prevented, which is interesting, and so we record it. A little girl, some four or five years old, was bitten by a dog in a state of fury; whether he was rabid or not was not accurately ascertained, for he was at once shot—(this, by the way, is a very foolish practice, for if the animal is chained up, as this was, and so incapable of doing harm, it would be as well to wait and test his condition). The parents of the child, very intelligent and affectionate, strictly kept from the child all idea of any permanent effects from the bite of the furious animal. She was bitten on the *tendo Achillis*. The dear child had no idea of hydrophobia, and had no fancy about its terrors.

The wound healed; but some weeks after, red lines were observed to pass up the leg and thigh from the wound. The child had difficulty of swallowing fluids; had oppression of the chest, and thought everything she looked on was a field of water; was agitated, alarmed, her sleep interrupted and anxious. Under these circumstances a homœopathic physician was consulted; he gave the child *Belladonna* and *Lachesis*, in very small doses, alternate weeks.

The child gradually lost her agitation and alarm; a few months after, by the physician's advice, she went to the seaside, with directions that she should be bathed in the sea or not, as she liked it or disliked it. She did not dislike it. This occurred two years ago; the child is now quite well.

Dr. Ramsbotham's case and Mr. Leadam's have been published. Now should not such cases open the eyes of the allopathic practitioners? It is very lately that a medical man has proposed *tracheotomy*, the opening of the windpipe, for this disease, as all (allopathic) means were confessedly of no use. Why not give remedies according to the homœopathic law, good sir?

"As a good workman is known by the quantity of his chips, so may a penetrative mind by the rubbish and heaps of discarded credulity with which it is surrounded. Taking the whole world at the present moment, can it be said to believe a thousandth part of what it believed a thousand years ago?"

It is therefore we entreat our allopathic brethren to investigate our doctrine and practice. We have got rid of the rubbish and heaps of discarded credulity, and we invite them to do likewise.

We protest, at all events, against the injurious mode in which we are treated by our adversaries. They *refuse to receive proof* of the success of our practice; they entrench themselves behind the barriers of authority; they stand on prescriptive privileges; they claim a sort of divine right of doctorship in medicine.

We have no grudge against them. We know that they are sore at the success of Homœopathy. It was dead, according to them, years ago; it is now living and full of life, by their own acknowledgment. We demand as a matter of right, that our claims to be heard should be duly received and fairly sifted. We play no underhand tricks; we practise no secret practice—our doings as well as our doctrines are patent to the world. We use no mystifications; we deal in no subterfuges; we ask no favor, but we demand justice and fair-play. Let a fair trial be instituted, and let it be shown which party is most *credulous*, the allopathic or homœopathic.

With respect to the integrity of our practitioners, we suppose that, taking them as a class, they are as respectable as our opponents.—*Hom. Times.*

HOMŒOPATHIC TREATMENT versus ALLOPATHIC.

(Communicated by Dr. HASTINGS,
Cheltenham.)

Some things *gain by comparison*, others lose. The following will speak for itself, and ought to convey a useful lesson to sceptics.

In the *Medical Times* (edited by that champion of allopathic treatment, of which the following is a specimen—Dr. Bushnan) of last Saturday, at page 262, the following case is reported:—

"There is at present under the care of Mr. Lloyd an old man, by trade a carpenter, in whom, while in perfect health, the bursa in front of the left patella suddenly became enlarged. It was unattended by pain, but as it interfered with his occupation, by preventing him from kneeling, he at once applied for surgical advice. The gentleman whom he consulted passed through the tumour a single thin ligature thread, and allowed him to walk home. The inflammatory process commenced almost immediately, and the rest of the day and the following day were passed in what he described as the most intense suffering. The next morning he applied for admission into the Hospital, the seton was, at once, withdrawn, and the large abscess which it had occasioned was laid open.* During the following week he progressed satisfactorily, when all at once another attack of inflammation took place, the thigh and leg became much swollen, and a large collection of matter was formed around the whole front aspect of the joint, which was attended with great local pain, and very serious constitutional disturbance. The second abscess has also been opened; the swelling is now much subsided and he appears likely to recover favorably, after having been, however, for some days placed in a critical position."

So much, then, for *legitimate practice*; now for a bit of rational practice, just for sake of contrast.

"Mrs. G—, aged 50, applied to me on the 8th ult., on account of a bursa, which had formed over the interior portion of the left patella. It gave her no pain, and only attracted her attention by its size, which was about that of a walnut; when I saw it, I prescribed *Puls.* and *Calc. c.*, an eight days' course of each, intermitting a few days between them. In three weeks the bursa was completely gone."

Let the public "look upon this picture and then upon that." The seton practice of the allopath had nearly finished the poor carpenter, and there is a great probability that the poor man will be dismissed the hospital "the shadow of his former self."

* The italics are mine, as I deem such legitimate practice worthy the attention of allopaths.

with an ankylosed or stiff knee; rendered incapable of ever again using it.

Had a homœopathist made such a mess of his patient's knee as these legalized allopaths did, the immaculate *Lancet*—though stained with blood—would have sung out for an action for damages. But whatever cruelties their blood-stained proceedings may effect, and whatever dead they may lay prostrate, they are quietly chronicled as every-day occurrences. But only let an unfortunate homœopathist act thus, and they thunder in his ears the terrors of "Mala Praxis," and even when he cures his patients by gentle and rational means, they call him quack, and shout humbuggery. Which of the two, think you, gentle reader, is the greater quack? The man with the seton needle, making an opening in his patient's knee, causing inflammation and abscesses, which have to be opened by the lancet of the hospital surgeon, and thus placing the life of his patient in imminent peril—"a critical position," truly—or the homœopathist with no other instrument but the tiny though potent medicinal globule, curing his patient in a prompt and gentle manner.

"Comparisons," they say, "are odious," every allopath who reads the above will say so; and, I think, if there is one thing more than another calculated to exhibit their practice in its true and real bearing, it would be a faithful narration of the *treatment* of cases under their care, contrasted with similar cases under homœopathic treatment. This would indeed be holding the mirror up to nature. What a fruitful theme for the graphic and life-speaking pen and pencil of Mr. Punch! Only fancy him sketching a sick man in one room, surrounded by dozens of pill-boxes, bottles, blisters, etc., reduced to a mere skeleton, leaning on his emaciated elbow, and, with rueful face, swallowing his prescribed nauseous compound, and in another room depicting a patient, sitting up in his bed, taking, with a cheerful look, the tiny globule, no pills, bottles, or blisters in sight.

How many years will it take to realize this idea? But I must conclude, as my readers may perhaps think that I am moving in an eccentric orbit and about to fly off at a tangent. Well, be it so. The world itself moves thus, and if I assume the tangent shape, it is only to give those behind and before me a peep at allopathy.—*Hon. Times*.

Sept. 14, 1852.

CLAIRVOYANCE.

On the subject of the application of Clairvoyance to the prescription of the remedy for disease, we would wish to offer a few remarks. Of later years it has been the practice of many persons, even among the

intelligent, to apply to clairvoyants to examine their condition and prescribe for their infirmities. This must certainly be done without reflection upon or examination into the subject. We will admit, for the sake of argument, the fact of clairvoyance, and will also admit that they may even, with accuracy if you choose, describe the anatomical appearance of the diseased part, or effects to the eye on the organ most afflicted, such as it would present if we could see through the matter that surrounds it; but even with all this admitted we are met with this difficulty when we proceed farther, and suppose that they can prescribe.

In prescription two things are necessary: 1st. A knowledge of the cause that probably produced the appearances witnessed, and 2d, what is essential to the homœopath, a knowledge of the remedy that will effect a cure or re-establishment of the normal condition of the patient. It has generally been admitted by the advocates of *mesmerism* that its effects are produced by some natural law, though at present but ill understood. Now, to suppose that persons under its influence can see the appearance of disease we have as above admitted. That may be the natural consequence of their condition, as it is said; but to suppose that they can prescribe is giving to *mesmerism* not a natural but a *miraculous effect*. For can it be that the mere act of man making a few passes over another can at once endow him with a knowledge which neither possesses? and that the cause of disease and curative effect of remedies, indeed the whole *arcana* of medicinal science, should be at once open to his view? This supposition is so absurd that even argument could not defeat it; and yet how can it be avoided? It cannot be claimed that inspiration can be produced by one human being acting on another. That can only proceed from God himself. It cannot be claimed that the knowledge of countless facts bearing upon the causes that produce the diseased appearance, that have been acquired by the minds of many men attentively watching the phenomena of disease, and handed down from generation to generation, thus slowly accumulated after great labor and research, can on the instant spring into the mind by these passes. Nor can it be claimed, however enlightened or

exalted the ratiocination of the subject of these passes, that also a knowledge of the curative action of remedies, with all their numberless effects, can thus be produced. Since such is the dilemma we are led into, we must adopt the absurdity, or suppose if cures have been effected by them they have been the result of the action of the patient's mind on their disease, or one of those happy *guesses* that may hit, and by jumping all facts and reasons, light upon the result by a blind chance. It would be out of the rule of nature were it otherwise.

[For the American Journal of Homœopathy.]

EUTHANASIA.

Intractable cases of disease occur in the practice of secessionists from the antiquarian farrago method, in which there are some inducements suggesting the propriety of returning to the quasi-rudiments. Perhaps one mistake that is made, is the neglect to acknowledge a fact—that we must have death. A physician cannot expect to continue a busy practice with no fatal cases. He has only to settle the matter in his mind as to in what way disease can be most successfully treated, with the production of the fewest factitious symptoms, and the greatest conservation concerning the strength of the patient. But perhaps the undeviating confidence in the new mode is sometimes temporarily substituted by a return to Allopathy, from the weighty considerations of sympathy with the patient—convincing friends of ability or loyalty to reputation, the comparative inception of Homœopathia as a science, and its previous trial in the case. It seems only time for a man to particularize himself with a sect when he has become satisfied of the superior practicability of the principles. If a man secedes he tells the world he was attracted by the greater possessions of the second love. If he reverses, the public should mark him and withdraw their confidence. If not a dishonest man he is equally dangerous to be employed if the fear of death and other unweighty inducements drift him about like a cork.

A man is a quack that is ready to "try it" in extreme cases, that introduces strangers, places bars for their friends, though perhaps anything but a gratified experiment

with the vitality of the patient, struggling and ready to go down.

A physician cannot positively say any more than a layman most ignorant of medical subjects, whether Homœopathia has done all it can or will do in an animatory case. Where death is expected from hour to hour, and day to day, the physician cannot say that now is the moment, positively, when hope in Homœopathia ended, and was strengthened by submitting to the wishes of some enthusiastic old woman, with confidence in her medical skill according to the size of her family.

In certain cases, the physician, as well as the anxious mother, believes there is hope as long as there's life. It is too often forgotten, however, by both parties, that the hope should be greater just in proportion as the entire charge of the patient is given to one who has become acquainted with the constitution.

In a medical point of view, this susceptible, rare practice, such hopeless versatility, is doing battle against our system, and unless it cease altogether, it will need preserving from its friends.

I am aware that in many instances patients are *allowed* to take almost any medicine that shall please the friends, because the physician believes that it will make very little difference what they do take. But is it not better that the physician retain his position and continue his advocacy of his profession? The patient will die as easy as if all its cousins had a shot at him. I believe, gentlemen of the profession, that this succumbing to consanguineous ignoramus in severe, hopeless cases of disease, is a most unheard-of method of proselyting, of introducing a new system of medical practice to the world. From this very same cause, I believe, persons have sometimes said to me, "Doctor, do you not try something else in *severe* cases, where Homœopathia has previously been employed?" As though you had been trying the new system in the incipient stages of the disease merely for effect, a kind of practical recommendation, but really did not rely upon it or believe it was effective. I generally inform such specimens of the Yankee element that I am in favor of an easy death.

New York, Oct. 13, 1852

C. B.